


Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Examiner; Dolores R. Collins  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



*FR*

7 December, 2005

Application: 10/612,675  
Art Unit 3711

Dear Commissioner,

1. DETAILED ACTION      My wife and I have diligently tried to follow the "guidelines suggested" for the Arrangement of the Specification. Sending the listing of the "Content of the Specification" and saying we need to follow the guidelines therein is like sending someone a Websters Dictionary and saying "the definition lies within." If your office would kindly and specifically speak (orally or in writing ) to the actual deficiency(ies) and provide a reasonable extension of time, we will expeditiously adjust the application for patent accordingly.
2. Claim Objections      Claim 4 was objected to because the preamble recited "The standard card deck derivative" and it depends on Claim 1 which recited "Unique card decks" in the preamble. The deck is unique. However, as in the standard and premium versions of many consumer products, automobiles as an example, there are standard or basic offerings, as well as, the deluxe or premium versions. The same is true with the offerings of this deck. The "Standard" version is as found in Claim 4 and the "Premium" version is as found in Claim 5
3. Claim Rejections      Your office states that Claims 1, 4 & 5 are rejected as obvious and that Scarnes discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia. Those rejections are not correct because by that rational Abell US-1,632,941, Freeman US-5,887,873 and most other applicants within Art Unit 3711 would not have received their patents. Scarnes, nor any other patent or card expert has put forth a deck of cards where the Jokers within are empowered, yet limited, to take tricks only of the same Indicia and/or suit color. No other previously patented deck has the adaptability to be incorporated (with little or no modification) to presently known card games played with "regular" decks. Therefore the content matter placed on the substrate of this invention does indeed, by method, association, empowerment and user playability distinctly alter the functional relationship and is not merely convenient. Thus the novel and unobvious functional relationships between the printed matter and the substrate, which have not been patented or described prior in a printed publication, does distinguish this invention and proves it unique and unquestionably suitable for patent.

Thank you for your kind suggestions that we procure the services of a patent attorney. However our loses incurred during hurricane Wilma and our present financial capabilities negate that option.

Sincerely,

Dennis D. King  
5441 Harborage Drive  
Fort Myers, Florida 33908  
615 336-8686

Carolyn E. King